

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS)

PETITION

Against the Bill – Praying to be heard by counsel, &c.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND
NORTHERN IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM
LONDON BOROUGH COUNCIL

SHEWETH as follows:

1. A Bill (hereinafter called “the Bill”) has been introduced into and is now pending in your honourable House intituled “A Bill to Make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Old Oak Common in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to a junction with the Channel Tunnel Rail Link at York Way in the London Borough of Islington and a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes”.
2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin, supported by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Theresa May, Secretary Vince Cable, Secretary Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary Eric Pickles, Secretary Owen Paterson, Secretary Edward Davey, and Mr Robert Goodwill.

3. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill's objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.
4. Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.
5. Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker ("the Nominated Undertaker") to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.
6. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill ("Phase One of HS2") are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Bill. They consist of scheduled works, which are described in Schedule 1 to the Bill and other works, which are described in clause 2 of and Schedules 2 and 3 to the Bill.
7. Your Petitioners are the local authority for the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and have been invested by Parliament with a number of important powers and duties in relation to the interests of the inhabitants of their area. Amongst other functions of your Petitioners is that of the highway authority for all existing or proposed public highways in their area, except for those which are the responsibility of Transport for London. In addition, your Petitioners are the traffic authority for most roads in their area. They are also the local planning authority and are thus responsible for general planning and the preparation of development plans. Your Petitioners have a statutory duty to investigate the existence of, and to control nuisances within their area.

8. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of your Petitioners and in accordance with the standing orders of your honourable House, notice has been served on your Petitioners of the intention to seek such compulsory powers.
9. Your Petitioners allege that they and their property, rights and interests in their area and the inhabitants thereof would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and they accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Introduction

10. The Bill makes provision for a number of works to be constructed in your Petitioners' area, but by far the most significant aspect is the proposal for an interchange station at Old Oak Common ("the Station"), which will serve HS2, Crossrail and the West Coast Mainline. As the Environmental Statement ("the ES") deposited with the Bill says, the triangular site for the station is bordered by Old Oak Common Lane and Wells House Road to the west, the Great Western Mainline tracks and North Pole depot to the south and the future Crossrail depot, pending construction, to the north.
11. Your Petitioners support the construction of the Station in principle. It provides a unique opportunity to harness the benefit to your Petitioners' borough of the regeneration of the Old Oak Common area. However, your Petitioners have concerns that that opportunity will not be exploited to the full if the Bill is allowed to pass into law in its current form.

Part 1: Site specific concerns

London Overground Connection

12. Your Petitioners are disappointed to note that the Bill contains no provision for a connection to the London Overground at Old Oak Common. The North London Line runs on a railway corridor adjacent to the western edge of the Station site and the West London Line runs to the east of the Station site and both lines connect to the north at Willesden Junction station.
13. In order to facilitate regeneration in a manner consistent with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, transport connections must be provided at all levels, ranging from

international to local. The current HS2 proposals would facilitate excellent international, national and regional connections, but would be lacking in sub-regional and local links. A London Overground connection would ensure that Old Oak Common is accessible to all five of these key markets.

14. A new London Overground connecting station at Old Oak Common would, in your Petitioners' submission, also result in the following benefits:
 - (a) reduction in overcrowding at Euston by providing additional connections for HS2 passengers at Old Oak Common;
 - (b) putting locations along the West London Line and North London Line in contact with a much greater jobs market, providing greater employment accessibility for residents and greater employee accessibility for businesses;
 - (c) helping to relieve pressure on the local highway network by providing public transport connections to the local area;
 - (d) providing benefits in the wider area, including additional homes and jobs and generating additional Gross Value Added to the UK economy.
15. Your Petitioners request your honourable House to amend the Bill so that it provides for an interchange station at Old Oak Common on the London Overground, serving both the North London Line and the West London Line.

Strategic road connections

16. The ES explains (Volume 2: Community Forum Area Report 4: Paragraph 2.3.24) that road access to the Station will be from entrances on Old Oak Common Lane to the west. It says that traffic will access and exit the station at two points to the north-west of the station and to the south of the station, close to the site access to the existing rail depots. Internal roads will provide access for buses, taxis, cars dropping-off passengers and emergency vehicles. They will also connect to the staff and short-term parking areas.
17. Your Petitioners consider that the proposals for highway improvements at and around the Station are inadequate. In your Petitioners' submission, those proposed improvements are unsuitable for the purpose of serving the Station, and unless

additional provision for road access is made, existing free capacity in the surrounding road network will be used up, prejudicing opportunities for further development and regeneration being brought forward in the area.

18. Having only access from the HS2 station to the west onto Old Oak Common Lane will add unacceptable pressure to the A40 junctions in the local area. Those junctions are already operating close to capacity. In your Petitioners' submission, further access points to the Station are required to help distribute traffic associated with the Station across the highway network. It is therefore considered essential by your Petitioners that an alternative access should be provided to the station from the east, through the provision of a vehicular bridge over the Grand Union Canal that would connect to Hythe Road and on to Scrubs Lane.
19. Transport for London have undertaken a study exploring the merits of an eastern connection to Scrubs Lane from the new station at Old Oak Common. Initial modelling suggests that around a third of all road trips heading to and from the Station would be via an alternative eastern link, relieving pressure on Old Oak Common Lane and routes to the west. There would be little disbenefit to Scrubs Lane as the Hythe Road/Scrubs Lane junction has capacity for this additional traffic.
20. As well as relieving congestion, an eastern station access would provide a direct connection to 35 hectares of land to the north of the Grand Union Canal which would dramatically improve the development potential in the area and act as a catalyst for regeneration.
21. An initial review of HS2 Limited's Transport Study suggests that significant delays will occur at key junctions as a result of the Station proposals. This emphasises the importance of increasing the permeability of the area through the creation of new connections and improving a number of existing junctions. Further improvements are likely to be required to accommodate the number of trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed redevelopment of the Station site. Your Petitioners consider that the Bill's Promoters should fund highway interventions to mitigate any congestion that will be caused as a result of the construction of the Station.
22. Your Petitioners respectfully request your honourable House to amend the Bill so that it includes a vehicular road access to the east of the Station crossing over the Grand Union Canal and linking to Scrubs Lane, and that the road must be completed before

the Station opens for public traffic. Your Petitioners also request your honourable House to require the Secretary of State or HS2 Limited to fund further reasonable highway improvements in the area, should they be recommended following further traffic studies conducted by your Petitioners, Transport for London and other responsible bodies.

Relocation of the Heathrow Express depot

23. According to the ES (Volume 2: Community Forum Area Report 4: Paragraph 2.3.6), the Station works will require the demolition of the Heathrow Express Depot ("the HEx depot") and the First Great Western depot ("the FGW depot") which are currently based where the Station is proposed to be constructed. It is proposed to relocate these facilities to a section of the North Pole depot. Further details on the relocation of the HEx and FGW depots are provided in Volume 4 of the ES (Off-route effects). The relocation works would need to be completed before any construction works could commence and, according to volume 4 of the ES, by 2017.
24. The North Pole depot straddles your Petitioners' border and the border of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea ("RBKC"). It is currently vacant, having being used previously as a depot for Eurostar trains. The depot covers 5.85 hectares of your Petitioners' area and is bounded to the south by the Mitre Bridge Industrial Estate, which covers 1.74 hectares. Your Petitioners and RBKC Council have been actively encouraging the redevelopment of the depot and adjacent land holdings (including the Mitre Bridge site) for mixed use, residential led development. LBHF promoted the North Pole East Depot land within its Borough for housing in the Old Oak Vision document that underwent public consultation in June to September 2013. It is unlikely that the Mitre Bridge site would come forward for development without the adjacent North Pole East depot doing likewise. The North Pole East Depot is also integral to regeneration of the whole Kensal Gasworks site in RBKC because it is needed to land a road bridge across the railway lines to provide a second road access to the site. Without a second road access, emergency access constraints mean the development capacity of the 16 hectare brownfield Kensal Gasworks site would be reduced to around 700 homes.
25. A Gross Value Added, Gross Development Value and Residual Value Study undertaken by DTZ indicates the relocation of the HEx depot to North Pole East would prevent

3,300 homes, 1,900 jobs and an estimated £1,088m Gross Value Added over 10 years (including over £25m in council tax and over £24m in New Homes Bonus revenues) and £1.2 billion Gross Development Value from being delivered across the Mitre Bridge Industrial estate, North Pole Depot and Kensal Gasworks sites. The North Pole Depot itself could deliver over 2,000 homes, generating a Gross Development Value of £745m and a residual value of £70m.

26. Your Petitioners have been in liaison with HS2 Ltd, the Department for Transport and Network Rail who are considering alternative sites along the Heathrow Express route for the relocation of the HEx depot. Your Petitioners would urge that process to continue, and for an alternative location to be used.
27. In the absence of a suitable alternative location being found, your Petitioners respectfully ask your honourable House to amend the Bill so as to delete the proposed relocation works, remove the North Pole depot from the Bill limits and require the Secretary of State to give an undertaking that the North Pole depot will not be used for purposes connected with Phase One of HS2.

Early delivery of Old Oak Common Crossrail Station

28. It is envisaged that both elements of the Station (HS2 and Crossrail/Great Western Main Line station) would open at the same time, currently programmed to be in 2026. Your Petitioners wish to see regeneration at Old Oak Common taking place at the earliest opportunity and for that reason are of the view that the construction of the Crossrail and Great Western Main Line elements of the Station should be brought forward, if it is possible.
29. Doing so would, in your Petitioners' respectful submission, also help to reduce any risk of delay in the delivery of HS2 unnecessarily holding up the opening of the Old Oak Common station for Crossrail and Great Western Main Line passengers. HS2 Limited's own Transport Assessment, contained in the ES, shows that large numbers of passengers will transfer between Crossrail and the Great Western main line at Old Oak Common, which adds weight to the case for early construction of the Crossrail station.
30. Your Petitioners respectfully request your honourable House to require the Secretary of State and HS2 Limited to bring forward the early delivery of the Crossrail and Great Western Main Line elements of the Station ahead of HS2.

Removal of compensatory wetland habitat proposed at Wormwood Scrubs

31. The ES identifies (Volume 2: Community Forum Area Report 4: Paragraph 7.4.19), a significant area of land in the south of Wormwood Scrubs Common as a "compensatory area of new wetland planting". The proposal appears to be included in order to provide mitigation for significant ecological effects from elsewhere along the HS2 construction corridor. Wormwood Scrubs Common is in the ownership and under the control of your Petitioners.
32. The creation of a wetland habitat would result in loss of valuable recreational space at one of the most well used sections of Wormwood Scrubs adjacent to its two largest car parks. It would act as a barrier to users who access the Scrubs from Hammersmith Hospital and the south and would make it more difficult to access the numerous recreational activities that operate in this area of the Scrubs, including baseball, football, weekend park runs and cross country running and would cut them off from the facilities in the Linford Christie Stadium.
33. Furthermore, the area that is intended to be replaced already contains important species and habitat which would be lost if replaced with the proposed compensatory wetland area. The mitigation measures proposed are inadequate, because they would not provide a new area of habitat at all but instead impose a new wetland area on Scrubs land that is already ecologically rich and well used for recreation.
34. In the event that a satisfactory agreement is not reached between your Petitioners and the Bill's promoters, your Petitioners respectfully request your honourable House to amend the Bill so as remove plots 77 and 78 in your Petitioners' area from the Bill limits and to require the Promoters of the Bill to refrain from using any area of the scrubs for any purpose unless they have the agreement of your Petitioners.

Temporary closure of Old Oak Common Lane

35. The ES explains (Volume 2: Community Forum Area Report 4: Paragraph 12.4.18) that the Bill will authorise the full closure of Old Oak Common Lane for up to 12 months, with a 3.5km diversion for general traffic and 3.5km diversion for bus 228. The main reason for the closure of Old Oak Common Lane appears to be for the progressive demolition and reconstruction of the Old Oak Common Lane bridges under the West Coast Main Line (Volume 2: Community Forum Area Report 4: Paragraphs 2.3.26 and

2.3.27) so as to facilitate construction and operation of the Great Western Main Line Old Oak Common Station, and to allow double deck buses under it.

36. Your Petitioners are very concerned about the closure of Old Oak Common Lane for such a long period. It would severely disrupt traffic and cause major disruption to local residents and businesses. The impact on passengers of diverting the 228 bus route is of particular concern especially in relation to those with mobility impairments. Bus stop relocations of over 400m represent a significant extra walking distance for pedestrians, particularly the mobility impaired and elderly. Your Petitioners believe that alternative methods of construction are possible which would not require a complete closure for such a length of time, for example by providing a temporary road surface and excavating from underneath, or allowing for alternate one-way traffic while the road is excavated. Your Petitioners believe that these and other solutions should be fully considered by the Promoters, and ask your honourable House to require the Promoters to adopt the one that best meets your Petitioners' concerns.
37. For pedestrians and cyclists, the proposed diversion would be unacceptable and at the very least, consideration should be given to providing alternatives such as temporary footbridges over the railway tracks. Another possibility could be the provision of pedestrian and cycle subways alongside the existing bridges, as is proposed at Victoria Road. Your Petitioners invite your honourable House to explore options for alternative, more effective, temporary access arrangements and make requirements of the Bill's promoters accordingly.

Removal of excavated material by road

38. A great deal of excavated material will need to be removed from the various construction sites in your Petitioners' area, for example as a result of the excavation of the Victoria Road crossover box and the Station box. Your Petitioners are pleased to note that the construction proposals include the use of the Willesden Euroterminal railhead and a connecting conveyor system which will eventually mean that a considerable amount of material will be removed by rail. However, for approximately 18 months prior to the railhead and the connecting conveyor system come into operation, all excavated material from the work sites is intended to be removed by road.

39. Your Petitioners are concerned about the impact of that on the road network and request that your honourable House require the Promoters of the Bill to consider and, if practicable, implement further options for the removal of excavated material by canal and rail rather than road from the outset of the construction period.

Link to North Acton underground station

40. North Acton underground station is on the Central Line and is located approximately 700 metres from the proposed Old Oak Common Station as the crow flies. Under the existing proposals, the distance that would need to be travelled by pedestrians and cyclists between the two stations would be approximately 1700m, using existing roads.
41. Along with others, in the summer of 2013 your Petitioners consulted on a draft vision for the regeneration of Old Oak Common linked to the proposed HS2 station. Two of the key comments raised were that cyclists had not been adequately considered and that the new Station should link up to the underground stations on the Central Line. Your Petitioners fear that without a dedicated pedestrian and cycle link being implemented at an early stage the new Station will become overly dependent on access by private car, which is undesirable in terms of sustainability.
42. Your Petitioners are of the view that enhanced local walking and cycle links are required in order to access the Station generally. A dedicated link for pedestrians and cyclists would allow direct access between the Central line and the new Station, allowing (if the suggestions requested by your Petitioners elsewhere in this petition in relation to connections to the Overground are adopted) better connectivity for Central Line passengers to HS2, Crossrail and London Overground services and vice versa.
43. Your Petitioners therefore request that your honourable House amend the Bill so that a dedicated pedestrian and cycle link of the type described above is provided as part of the main works authorised by the Bill.

Crossrail spur to West Coast Main Line

44. Passenger volumes at Euston station are forecast to increase substantially once Phase One of HS2 comes into operation, and more so when Phase Two follows. Therefore,

options for relieving Euston Station should, in your Petitioners' submission be considered.

45. In common with others, your Petitioners support the proposal for the construction of a spur from Crossrail to the West Coast Main Line. That would have the effect of enabling passengers on the West Coast Main Line to take trains directly into central London, without changing at Euston, or indeed at Old Oak Common. In turn, that would result in a reduction in the number of trains arriving at and departing from Euston and a reduction in passenger congestion at Euston, freeing up platform capacity. Further economic benefits would be attained because the proposed spur would connect to stations at Wembley, Harrow and Watford, improving accessibility to a wider labour market.
46. Carrying out these works as part of Phase One of HS2 would avoid returning at a later date to undertake substantially more expensive works and a longer period of disruption to services in the Old Oak Common area, particularly on the Great Western Main Line.
47. Your Petitioners support the case for the provision of rail infrastructure to enable an extension to Crossrail services to join the West Coast Mainline at a later date and therefore respectfully ask your honourable House to amend the Bill so as to include provision for the proposed spur, to be constructed as part of the Phase One HS2 works.

Access Old Oak Common Station to Wormwood Scrubs

48. The Station's north-south concourse is currently proposed to be a paid space. This would not allow for the through movement of people travelling from the north of the station to access Wormwood Scrubs to the south.
49. In your Petitioners' submission, the concourse should be widened so that a generous aisle can be provided allowing for north-south unpaid access through the concourse and enabling works should be provided to the south of the station to provide passive provision for a southern access to the station that could be opened once development proposals are brought forward for the North Pole depot and Intercity Express Programme IEP depot sites. Your Petitioners respectfully request your honourable House to amend the Bill so that such provision is made as part of the main works

authorised by the Bill. If your honourable House agrees with your Petitioners and requires that the Nominated Undertaker should facilitate access to the Scrubs from the north in the way proposed, the Nominated Undertaker should also, in your Petitioners' submission, be required in doing so to exercise due care and sensitivity to ensure the preservation of the area and prevent undue harm.

Part 2: General concerns

Land: Acquisition of Council Land

50. A great deal of land in the ownership of your Petitioners is liable to compulsory acquisition under clauses 4 to 9 of the Bill. The limits of deviation and of land to be acquired and used are drawn very widely in certain cases and your Petitioners are unsure in every case as to why that is. Your Petitioners may seek undertakings from the promoter of the Bill that the extent of compulsory purchase should be limited in certain cases either geographically or so that acquisition and use of your Petitioners' land is on a temporary basis only. Your Petitioners also wish to ensure that they are properly compensated as respects the acquisition and use of their land, and are concerned to note that by virtue of clause 9 of the Bill the subsoil of some of their highway land can be taken and used by the Secretary of State without the need for him to acquire it.

Provision of information and consultation

51. Your Petitioners have serious concerns over the provision of information supplied by the promoter of the Bill, both prior to the deposit of the Bill and up to the date of the deposit of this petition. This has meant that thorough and detailed assessments of the proposed project, its impacts and benefits have been impossible to compile. Your Petitioners are concerned that requests for further information and responses to specific requests remain outstanding. In particular, your Petitioners are still to be satisfied about the adequacy of the Environmental Statement. Baseline assumptions made over a number of generic issues have still to be substantiated. Ancillary documentation such as the proposed Code of Construction Practice remains in a draft form which is neither acceptable in principle, nor in its presumptions, proposals and extent of detail.

Environmental Statement: Adequacy and Accuracy

52. In accordance with the standing orders of your Honourable House, comments on the Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill were invited in the newspaper notices that were published in accordance with the standing orders of your honourable House when the Bill was deposited. Your Petitioners accordingly sent detailed comments to the promoter of the Bill in response, and these have been the subject of a report by the independent assessor appointed by your honourable House. Your Petitioner has raised a great deal of concerns about the adequacy and accuracy of the Environmental Statement.
53. Fundamental deficiencies in the Environmental Statement have been identified by your Petitioners, including the following:
- (a) deep concern regarding the significant economic opportunity that is being lost as a result of the decision to use the North Pole Depot, the consequences of it which are not acknowledged within the Environmental Statement;
 - (b) the proposed road layouts and interventions contained within the Environmental Statement are inadequate and fail to meet the needs of the future and current road network;
 - (c) the Environmental Statement fails to consider how the impact of an eastern access to the station could assist in reducing the impact on the current road network;
 - (d) the Environmental Statement fails to consider adequately the impact of the closure of Old Oak Common Lane on residents and businesses for twelve months during the construction process;
 - (e) the Environmental Statement fails to consider the disbenefit created by HS2's refusal to consider the early delivery of Overground and Crossrail links in Old Oak Common in advance of HS2;
 - (f) the opportunities for the use of rail and canal for the transport of construction materials and spoil have been insufficiently investigated in the Environmental Statement, with consequent greater than necessary reliance on road transport and adverse effects on the highway network;

- (g) the Environmental Statement has failed to adequately consider the impact on amenity users of Wormwood Scrubs specifically by the inclusion of the proposed wetland nature reserve in the south of the Scrubs and the site compound in the northwest corner of the Scrubs;
- (h) the Environmental Statement fails to consider adequately the impact on the ecology of Wormwood Scrubs, the Grand Union Canal and Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINCs) and has not provided enough detail regarding the proposed mitigation;
- (i) the Environmental Statement is insufficient in terms of its reference to mitigation measures and monitoring of flooding risk, specifically, there is a need to monitor impacts during operation not only during construction.

54. It is vital that the deficiencies in the Environmental Statement identified by your Petitioners are remedied by the Promoter of the Bill, whether by way of an addendum to the Environmental Statement or otherwise. One reason this is so important is that the Environmental Minimum Requirements, which have been produced by the promoter of the Bill in draft, contain important obligations which will fall on the nominated undertaker when constructing and operating the railway, and a number of those obligations are specifically tied in to the Environmental Statement and depend upon its accuracy.

Authorisation procedures

55. In line with the Crossrail and Channel Tunnel Rail Link Acts, the Bill contains provisions which provide outline planning permission for the development authorised by the Bill and disapply a number of other statutory regulation regimes which would normally apply in relation to the construction of works, including the listed buildings and conservation area controls in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, [and] the Control of Pollution Act 1974 [and the London Lorry Ban]. Your Petitioners wish to ensure that if those controls are to be removed or suspended then in their place there is a robust alternative approval mechanism in each case, in which your Petitioners play a full part. Your Petitioners will, in conjunction with other local authorities affected by the Bill, be seeking to ensure that such arrangements are put in place, but if that is not achieved then your Petitioners would respectfully request

that the promoter of the Bill be required to accept satisfactory arrangements including realistic timescales for the consideration of applications.

Planning: Conditions

56. Your Petitioners note that the planning regime set out in the Bill is very similar to that contained in both the Channel Tunnel Rail Link Act 1996 and the Crossrail Act 2007. However, there is one significant difference that causes Your Petitioners considerable concern, namely sub-paragraph 2(7) of Schedule 16 to the Bill. That sub-paragraph says that the relevant planning authority may impose conditions on approval of detailed plans and specifications only with the agreement of the nominated undertaker. This tautological provision could render the planning authorities unable to impose conditions and should be struck from the Bill. Your Petitioners' concern applies to any other provision in the Bill in which authorities are given powers to impose conditions or other matters, only with the agreement of the nominated undertaker.

Local authority costs: CoCP compliance

57. Your Petitioners note that the Bill and the supporting documents adopt similar regimes to those which were established for the construction of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link and Crossrail. Your Petitioners are pleased to note that this regime will include the agreement of a code of construction practice ("CoCP"), and local area management plans ("LEMPs"). Your Petitioners will wish to ensure that the CoCP is complied with properly, and in that respect, your Petitioners will incur a great deal of expenditure. Your Petitioners wish to ensure that all of their reasonable expenses in monitoring construction sites are met by the nominated undertaker, together with expenditure incurred by your Petitioners in planning and programming activities related to the CoCPs and in enforcing them.

Local authority costs: Other authorisation costs

58. As part of the alternative consent regimes mentioned above, your Petitioners must be able to recover from the promoter of the Bill or the nominated undertaker their full costs of processing applications. Your Petitioners note that the Bill provides the Secretary of State with the power to make an order relating to the payment of fees to the local planning authority in respect of requests for detailed planning consent. Your

Petitioners are pleased to note this, but seek assurances from the promoter of the Bill about the level of those fees and the ability of the promoter of the Bill to cover their costs of dealing with all applications, not just those directly related to the planning provisions in the Bill, and taking enforcement action where necessary.

General

59. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

YOUR PETITIONERS THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAY

your Honourable House that the Bill may not pass into law as it now stands and that they be heard by themselves, their counsel, agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this petition, against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights, and interests of your Petitioners and in support of such other clauses and amendments as may be necessary and proper for their protection and benefit.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS will ever pray, &c.

SHARPE PRITCHARD LLP

Agents for Hammersmith and
Fulham London Borough Council

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS)

PETITION

of

HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM LONDON BOROUGH
COUNCIL

AGAINST,

BY COUNSEL, &c.

SHARPE PRITCHARD LLP
Elizabeth House
Fulwood Place
London WC1V 6HG
Parliamentary Agents